



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/897,354	07/02/2001	Pekka Ketola	460-010421-US(PAR)	8266

2512 7590 03/28/2005

PERMAN & GREEN
425 POST ROAD
FAIRFIELD, CT 06824

EXAMINER

LIN, WEN TAI

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2154

DATE MAILED: 03/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/897,354	KETOLA, PEKKA	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Wen-Tai Lin	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 January 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-6,8-15 and 17-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-6, 8-15 and 17-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Wen-Tai Lin
3/24/05

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 3-6, 8-15 and 17-23 are presented for examination. Claims 2, 7 and 16 are canceled; claims 22-23 are newly added; and claims 1, 3-6, 8-15 and 17-21 have been amended.
2. The text of those sections of Title 35, USC code not included in this action can be found in the prior Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. Claims 1, 3-4, 8-11, 15 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Picard et al. [U.S. Pat. No. 6233318].
4. Picard was cited in the previous office action.
5. As to claim 1, Picard teaches the invention as claimed including: a system for controlling by a terminal [e.g., 60, Fig.1 or 110, Fig.4] at least a first and a second remote mailbox [e.g., 66, 68, Figs.1-3 or 115-120, Fig.4] located in at least one e-mail server [e.g., 106, 115, Fig.4], comprising means [e.g., 106, Fig.4] for arranging an at least partly simultaneous connection between the terminal and said e-mail server

Art Unit: 2154

maintaining said first remote mailbox, and between the terminal and said e-mail server maintaining said second remote mailbox [note that the connections as illustrated in Figs. 1-4 are TCP/IP and PPP connections], and said terminal comprising means [e.g., a browser] for controlling said remote mailboxes substantially simultaneously by means of said connections [col.5, line 13 – col.6, line 23; col.2, lines 26-33; col.13, lines 11-39; col.14, line 53 – col.16, line 44].

6. As to claim 3, Picard further teaches that an e-mail program [e.g., the browser] is arranged to be used for controlling said remote mailboxes, which e-mail program is provided with the capability to control several remote mailboxes [e.g., issuing a refresh request] substantially simultaneously, and in which each remote mailbox is provided with a unique identification, such as an icon or a name [col.13, lines 11-40; col.21, lines 24 – 34].

7. As to claim 4, Picard further teaches that a notification of an e-mail message that has arrived in one of said remote mailboxes is arranged to be produced for the user, characterized in that said notification is arranged to be provided with a unique identification of that remote mailbox to which the e-mail message has arrived [col.17, lines 8-15; col.20, lines 56-59; col.13, lines 11-21].

Art Unit: 2154

8. As to claims 8-11, 15 and 17-18, since the features of these claims can also be found in claims 1 and 3-4, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1 and 3-4 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 5-6, 12-13, 19-20 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Picard et al. (hereafter "Picard") [U.S. Pat. No. 6233318], as applied to claims 1-4, 8-11 and 15, 17-18 above.

11. As to claims 5-6, Picard further teaches that the user in the e-mail program is provided with the capability to formulate and send e-mail messages [col.3, lines 60-62; col.18, line 66 – col.19, line 25; Fig.11]. Picard does not specifically teach that the e-mail address of the user to be attached to the e-mail message to be transmitted is arranged to be selected in the e-mail program.

However, it is well known in the art to click the "reply" button for replying a message, wherein the original receiving mailbox's address is used as a sending

Art Unit: 2154

mailbox. In a like manner, one would like to provide a sending mailbox's address that is consistent with an address that the recipient of the mail can be replied to. Since Picard's system integrates existing mailboxes of a subscriber and allow reception of mails from non-subscribers (i.e., the non-subscribers only knows the address of a convention mailboxes), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the received mailbox as default sending address because by doing so it would make Picard's system transparent to the non-subscribers [col.8, lines 33-34 and 46- 67].

12. As to claims 12-13, 19-20 and 23, since the features of these claims can also be found in claims 1-6, 8-11 and 15, 17-18, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-6, 8-11 and 15, 17-18 above.

As for the additional limitation requiring the terminal to use wireless communication in claim 23: it is noted that Picard teaches such a feature at col.4, lines 4-14.

13. Claims 14 and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Picard et al.(hereafter "Picard") [U.S. Pat. No. 6233318], as applied to claims 1-6, 8-13 and 15, 17-20 above, further in view of AAPA [Applicant admitted prior art].

14. As to claims 14 and 21-22, Picard does not specifically teach that the system/method can be adopted in a GPRS system which contains means for establishing PDP connections. However, AAPA teaches that it is well known that a

GPRS subscriber can have several different PDP connections, by which it facilitates the IP connections from a mobile device [col.2, lines 9-19].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have extended Picard's system to GPRS subscribers because AAPA teaches that GPRS system looks externally like an ordinary subnet of the Internet network and by expanding Picard's service to GPRS subscribers it would further broaden Picard's customer base.

15. Applicant's arguments filed on 1/14/2005 for claims 1, 3-6, 8-15 and 17-23 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

Specifically, Applicant argues in the remarks that Picard's terminal is connected to a VMS device (e.g., 106 of Fig.4) for acquiring message lists, instead of connecting to all the mailboxes and controlling them simultaneously.

16. The examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant's remarks because:

(1) the claim languages require maintaining "partly simultaneous connection" instead of the acclaimed "simultaneous connection"; and

(2) Picard teaches at least two embodiments for communicating various mailbox messages to a terminal: (i) using separate TCP/IP connections to each mailboxes on a single dialup PPP connection [see Fig.1 and col.5, lines 13-21]; and (ii) using a director to unify the different mailboxes, wherein the director may be tightly coupled to one mailbox (such as 68 of Figs 1-3), but acting as real-time proxy for other type of

Art Unit: 2154

mailboxes [see Figs.2-4 and 6; col.5, line 50 – col.6, line 23]. For the second embodiment, a subscriber only needs to log into a VMS because the latter then automatically logs into another associated servers for other types of mailboxes [e.g., EMS, col.13, lines 11-21]. As such, for at the duration the VMS is connected to the EMS, the terminal is connected simultaneously to both mailboxes.

17. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

18. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

Examiner note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant.

Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the contest of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wen-Tai Lin whose telephone number is (571)272-3969. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-5:00) .

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571)272-3964. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703)872-9306 for official communications; and

(571)273-3969 for status inquires draft communication.

Art Unit: 2154

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Wen-Tai Lin

March 23, 2005

Wen-Tai Lin
3/24/05